

233 South Wacker Drive Suite 800 Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400 www.cmap.illinois.gov

Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 16, 2011

Offices of the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)

DuPage County Conference Room

Suite 800, 233 S. Wacker Drive, Willis Tower, Chicago, Illinois

Members Present:

Mark Avery (chair), Ed Paesel (co-chair), Robert Cole, Roger Dahlstrom, Kimberly Flom (for Karie Friling), David Galowich, Jim LaBelle, Curt Paddock, Dennis Sandquist, Heather Smith, Heather Tabbert, Nathaniel Werner

Members Absent:

Judy Beck, Jerry Conrad, Kristi DeLaurentiis, Lisa DiChiera, Robert Palmer, Norm West, Nancy Williamson, Jeromie Winsor

Staff Present:

Stephen Ostrander (committee liaison), Ylda Capriccioso, Bob Dean, Lindsay Hollander, Ricardo Lopez, Matthew Maloney, Pete Saunders, Daniel Ungerleider

Others Present:

Erika Hasle (Field Museum), David Husemoller (Lake County), Jan LaBelle, Ryan Richter (Metra), Laurel Ross (Field Museum), Phil Rovang (Lake County), Jane Turley (Orland Park), Eric Waggoner (Lake County)

1.0 Call to Order

Chair Mark Avery called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes.

3.0 Approval of Meeting Notes

A motion to approve the minutes of January 19, 2011, was made by Than Werner and seconded by David Galowich. All in favor, the motion carried.

4.0 Update on Value Capture Strategies – Next Steps for CMAP – Matthew Maloney and Ylda Capriccioso, CMAP

Matt Maloney stated that CMAP is entering the second phase of its work on value capture strat-

egies; this second phase was approved by the CMAP Board the preceding week, and will need to be done by the end of June. The focus will be on three actual projects that have momentum. In short, CMAP wants to get some actual numbers to help it evaluate these strategies. Ylda Capriccioso briefly covered the legislative side of this work, and told the committee that the CMAP State Agenda (included in the packet for this month's meeting) mentions pursuing this (in admittedly broad language).

Ed Paesel asked whether CMAP had decided how to choose projects, to which Matt answered that they might look to the ULI Plenary, and the Land Use Committee could be another.

Jim LaBelle suggested that it would be a good idea to look at GO TO 2040.

Mark Avery mentioned the Governors Council, noting that on the Elgin O'Hare Bypass it has begun looking at value capture strategies.

Ed suggested looking at the Southeast Commuter Rail Line could be worthwhile.

Jim LaBelle mentioned that public-private legislation in the works (in Springfield), while different, could have relevance.

Dennis Sandquist stated that it is important to consider projects in formative stages (which could benefit from analysis early on).

5.0 Committee Review of Applications to the GO TO 2040 Local Technical Assistance Program – Bob Dean, CMAP

Bob Dean provided an overview of the applications received for the LTA program.

He noted that CMAP will be trying to find ways to assist with nearly all of the proposals submitted (i.e. excluding those ineligible), whether through the LTA program and other standard CMAP resources/services, or guide them to grant opportunities, or to CMAP partners that can better assist them.

Mark Avery invited general consensus from the members of the Land Use Committee on criteria for LTA project prioritization.

David Galowich asked Bob whether there were any HUD restrictions regarding which type of projects were eligible (due to HUD funding of the LTA program). Bob responded that none had been identified, and sample projects—in line with the sort of projects submitted by applicants—given to HUD (when CMAP applied for the HUD grant) were approved; that said, CMAP will be mostly focusing on transit and land use.

Ed Paesel: considering that there appears to be comprehensive plan updates in neighboring communities, CMAP may want to require collaboration and coordination between them.

Heather Smith: How many will be done? Bob: approximately 20 this year, but planning on working in some capacity with half. Heather Smith: What isn't eligible? Bob: Most are, only a few are not (e.g. single site-level projects are generally not eligible).

Than Werner: Priority should be given to disadvantaged communities. Bob: This is one of the main criteria being considered.

Curt Paddock said that he wanted to echo and underscore the importance of community need as criteria for selection. This should be an overriding factor.

Dennis Sandquist noted that the feasibility of the project—specifically the capacity and commitment of the community to support the project (to the best of their ability)—should also be a primary criterion. Bob Dean responded that CMAP is trying to gauge this through the extensive follow-up calls being completed with every applicant.

Rob Cole ("echoing" what Ed Paesel had said earlier) also supported the idea of aggregating the projects of neighboring communities to the degree feasible and relevant. Bob: This is also something that may come out in project scoping. Rob: may look where there are clusters in vicinity, especially in areas of fiscal constraint.

Jim LaBelle: Important to be certain that the best principles of the GO TO 2040 plan are included in any projects given priority in the LTA program; for example, perhaps projects (where relevant) should require the inclusion of affordable housing, including a demonstrated commitment in the past. Also, there is a need to consider how these projects might lead to something else, and be a "best" example; for example, if the LTA program helps a community write a comprehensive plan, it should be the "best" plan (i.e. one which incorporates as many of the recommendations of GO TO 2040 as possible/relevant).

David Galowich said that he would like to see some of these specific projects brought before the Land Use Committee (for feedback, insights from committee members). Bob: We (absolutely) plan to do this.

Curt Paddock noted the importance of geographic equity, and noted that some areas would likely be disgruntled if this isn't achieved. Bob responded that CMAP cannot promise to have a project in every county in every year (as this is dependent on the ac-

tual applications received from different areas of the region), but CMAP expects to always have a project in the City of Chicago and suburban Cook County.

Heather Smith: Have there been plans for more general trainings for groups, etc.? Bob: We're doing some planning commissioner trainings this spring, and we plan to provide this sort of general assistance going forward.

David Galowich asked how many years the LTA program was slated for, and how many projects were to be done. Bob answered that the LTA program is slated to last 3 years, and at least in this first year, CMAP hopes to handle approximately 20 projects.

Mark Avery: How many calls for projects will be made each year? Bob: CMAP expects 2-3 times per year, with communities that didn't apply in January being able to submit applications as well as communities that submitted projects not given a high priority status to alter their project proposals and resubmit.

Jim LaBelle: Considering that, for example, the writing of a comprehensive plan generally involves many people, how will CMAP (successfully staff these projects)? Bob: One CMAP staff person will be assigned as the primary point person, but he or she will depend on (and work with) other staff members, partners, etc. as the project moves forward.

Jim LaBelle stated that it's important that communities don't think that CMAP will do it all (and that they don' have to participate). Bob: CMAP will develop a memorandum of understanding of their role as a requirement for LTA involvement.

Phil Rovang (Lake County): Is there any upper limit to the scope (for example, some comprehensive plans can require monumental resources)? Bob: some projects will only take 2-3 months, while comprehensive plans are expected to take approximately 18 months (and possibly more).

David Galowich: How many NGOs applied, and how are they eligible? Bob: NGOs/nonprofits/etc. must be partnered with local government (e.g. with a municipality or the relevant county).

Kim Flom (Orland Park): Are you planning on ranking projects based on criteria? Bob: Yes, but it will mostly be qualitative (e.g. key criteria will include "readiness" and whether there is already a solid scope of work)

Jim LaBelle: Are there gap sin the types of applications that were received? Bob: Not many applications from municipalities addressed housing issues. There was more in-

terested than expected in water related issues, but less than expected in energy related issues. Also, less than expected from communities with large Latino populations.

Heather Smith: Has HUD provided any additional guidance? Bob: No, perhaps because CMAP's LTA program is different (in its approach to local assistance) than the other projects HUD is funding.

Kim Flom (Orland Park): Will CMAP balance out types of projects? Bob: Yes, in part because of the variety of skills of staff being hired to lead these projects.

David Galowich stated that (adherence to the principles of) GO To 2040 should probably be the most important criterion, and that "looking at the big picture" is essential. He also noted that he, too, liked the idea of aggregating/clustering projects together.

Jim LaBelle noted that he's not sure whether comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances should be the priority; perhaps it would be better to focus on projects which will result in "something we can see and feel." Dennis Sandquist responded that the majority of (on the ground) projects come about through private investment, so comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance updates are important to guide/assist that process. Mark Avery also responded that while he respected what Jim said, he agreed more with Dennis on this specific point; also, he hoped that projects involving comprehensive plan updates cited specific goals to be addressed/accomplished.

Ed Paesel said that he wanted to clarify his earlier comment, in that he also supports the LTA assisting with updates of comprehensive plans for individual municipalities. He also noted that municipal staff should be trained how to implement these comprehensive plans (themselves) once they are finished.

Pete Saunders noted that CMAP didn't get as many requests for assistance with subarea plans as he personally expected.

Heather Tabbert mentioned that the RTA identified about 25 projects that would be eligible for RTA assistance (through their grant programs, etc.). Mark Avery then asked whether there would be a transfer of the project to the RTA in some of those cases, to which Bob responded that there would be a transfer, but it would be informal in nature, including guiding some applicants to opportunities (RTA or otherwise) that have deadlines.

Mark Avery: (Considering the very large number of applicants) would it be possible for CMAP to do more "culling" of applicants after follow-up discussions are completed and then return to the Land Use Committee with a more condensed list? Bob: Yes, pro-

jects (in the "needs more scoping" category) will be brought back to the committee in March; this is expected to include approximately 50 projects. Rob Cole supported this idea, as did Jim LaBelle, who suggested that he was very enthusiastic about the idea of the Land Use Committee also advising projects as they move forward.

7.0 Next Meeting:

March 16, 2011

8.0 Other Business

Stephen Ostrander mentioned that there was a conflict on (the regular Land Use Committee meeting time of) April 20, 2011, with the CMAP Board, which needs to meet that morning. The committee decided to meet instead one week later, on April 27, 2011, from 9am – 11am.

9.0 Public Comment

None

10.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:31am

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Ostrander

Staff Liaison to the Land Use Committee